



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

59

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/691,091	10/18/2000	Corey Young	2222.0420001	3750

26111 7590 03/29/2005

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

PHAN, TAM T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2144

DATE MAILED: 03/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/691,091

Applicant(s)

YOUNG ET AL.

Examiner

Tam (Jenny) Phan

Art Unit

2144

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 November 2004.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 October 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2144

DETAILED ACTION

1. Amendment received on 11/09/2004 has been entered into record. Claims 2, 9-15, and 18-20 are currently amended.
2. Claims 1-30 remain pending.

Priority

3. This application claims benefit of the provisional application 60/160,242 (10/18/1999).
4. The effective filing date for the subject matter defined in the pending claims which has support in parent 60/160,242 in this application is 10/18/1999. Any new subject matter defined in the claims not previously disclosed in parent 60/160,242, is entitled to the effective filing date of 10/18/2000.

Drawings

5. This application has been filed with informal drawings, which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 3-4, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Ryzin et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,446,080), hereinafter referred to as Ryzin, in view of Mogul (U.S. Patent Number 5,802,292).

Art Unit: 2144

8. Regarding claim 1, Ryzin disclosed a method for reducing latency in sequential record browser, comprising the steps of: defining a sequential list of records [tracks] (Figures 6-7b, column 4 lines 57-64, column 5 lines 19-33); selecting a record from the list for review [play] (Figures 2 & 8, column 6 lines 10-21); downloading the selected, and records ordered sequentially thereafter until interrupted, downloaded records being available for browsing absent the retrieval delay (Figures 2 & 8, column 6 lines 10-21); interrupting the download by selecting a non-sequential record from the list (Figure 3, column 3 lines 6-12, column 3 line 66-column 4 line 3, column 6 line 56-65).

9. Ryzin taught the invention substantially as claimed. However, in the step of defining a sequential list of records, Ryzin did not expressly teach the records having retrieval latency and in the step of interrupting, Ryzin did not expressly teach downloading the non-sequential record and records sequentially thereafter until interrupted.

10. Ryzin suggested exploration of art and/or provided a reason to modify the method to include the retrieval latency and the downloading non-sequential record feature (column 4 lines 57-67, column 5 line 59-column 6 line 4).

11. Mogul disclosed records [objectives] having retrieval latency and when the download [prefetch] process is interrupted, the non-sequential record [users' explicit request] is downloaded along with the records sequentially thereafter (column 4 lines 13-24).

12. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method of Ryzin with the teachings of Mogul to include the retrieval latency and the downloading non-sequential record features in

Art Unit: 2144

order to speed up access to a resource that is selected by a user (Mogul, column 1 lines 33-39, lines 60-65) since users in general do not like to wait for their results when accessing the Internet. Users that are forced to wait would typically avoid using resources that take a long time to access (Mogul, column 1 lines 33-39).

13. Regarding claim 3, Ryzin disclosed a method wherein said method is executed by a browser application (column 4 lines 57-64).

14. Regarding claim 4, Ryzin disclosed a method wherein said method is executed by a browser plug-in or extension (column 4 lines 61-67 and column 5 lines 1-4).

15. Regarding claim 6, Mogul and Ryzin combined disclose a method further comprising the steps of communicating through a network to a server hosting the records; and presenting a list of record to a user, prior to receiving a selection of a record from the user (Ryzin, Figures 2, 7a-7b, 9, 10, column 5 lines 45-49; Mogul, Figures 1-2, column 2 lines 22-44).

16. Since all the limitations of the claimed invention were disclosed by the combination of Ryzin and Mogul, claims 1, 3-4, and 6 are rejected.

17. Claims 5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Ryzin et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,446,080), hereinafter referred to as Ryzin, as applied above in view of Mogul (U.S. Patent Number 5,802,292), and further in view of Schulhof et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,557,541), hereinafter referred to as Schulhof.

18. Regarding claim 5, Regarding claim 1, Ryzin disclosed a method for reducing latency in sequential record browser, comprising the steps of: defining a sequential list of records [tracks] (Figures 6-7b, column 4 lines 57-64, column 5 lines 19-33); selecting

Art Unit: 2144

a record from the list for review [play] (Figures 2 & 8, column 6 lines 10-21); downloading the selected, and records ordered sequentially thereafter until interrupted, downloaded records being available for browsing absent the retrieval delay (Figures 2 & 8, column 6 lines 10-21); interrupting the download by selecting a non-sequential record from the list (column 3 lines 6-10, column 5 line 59-column 6 line 4, column 6 line 58-65). Mogul disclosed records [objectives] having retrieval latency and when the download [prefetch] process is interrupted, the non-sequential record [users' explicit request] is downloaded along with the records sequentially thereafter (column 4 lines 13-24).

19. The combination of Ryzin and Mogul taught the invention substantially as claimed. However, the combination of Ryzin and Mogul did not disclose the step of cost accounting for downloading of each record. However, Schulhof disclosed a distribution system that enables a subscriber to select desired programs [download of each record] and to be charged for the service [cost accounting of downloading records] (column 6 lines 33-40).

20. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to employ the use of cost accounting to charge for downloading materials in order to prevent copyright infringement should materials relate to multimedia, literature, etc. Billing the subscribers for each record of downloaded materials will prevent non-subscribers from abusing the network bandwidth.

21. Regarding claim 7, Schulhof disclosed the steps of: accounting for a downloaded record; and limiting said downloading based on predetermined parameter (column 6 lines 33-40, column 8 lines 4-14, and column 9 lines 30-35).

Art Unit: 2144

22. Since all the limitations of the claimed invention were disclosed by the combination of Ryzin, Mogul, and Schulhof, claims 5 and 7 are rejected.

23. Claims 2, 15, and 21-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mogul (U.S. Patent Number 5,802,292), in view of Guedalia et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,535,878), hereinafter referred to as Guedalia.

24. Regarding claim 2, Mogul disclosed a method for prequeuing of files predicted to be desired by a user, comprising: defining a restrictive criteria to select a list of files (Abstract, Figure 2, column 2 lines 22-44); transferring files on the list into a local cache, in anticipation of a user selection thereof, files already transferred to the local cache having a shorter delay for review than those which have not been previously transferred to the local cache, an order of file transfer being responsive to the prediction of user review requirements, the prediction being responsive to any change in a user deviation from the predicted order (Title, Abstract, Figures 1-2, column 1 lines 59-65, column 2 lines 7-16, column 4 lines 5-24); receiving a starting point within the list of files, for file review, from the user, such that predicted latencies for sequential file review from any starting point are reduced (Abstract, Figure 2, column 3 lines 54-57, column 4 lines 5-24, lines 38-52).

25. Mogul taught the invention substantially as claimed. However, Mogul did not expressly teach a step of *automatically transferring files* on the list into a local cache.

26. Mogul suggested exploration of art and/or provided a reason to modify the method with the automatic transferring feature (column 1 lines 60-65).

Art Unit: 2144

27. Guedalia disclosed a step of automatically transferring files on the list to the client storage media (Abstract, Figures 1-2, column 8 lines 23-33, column 9 lines 19-29).

28. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method of Mogul with the teachings of Guedalia to include the automatic transferring feature in order to reduce the actual retrieval latency (Mogul, column 1 lines 60-65) since automatic transferring of predicted object would be able to make the latency appear zero when a user request the object (Mogul, column 1 lines 60-65).

29. Regarding claim 15, the browser corresponds to the method of claim 2, and thus is rejected using the same rationale.

30. Regarding claim 21, Mogul and Guedalia combined disclosed a method for transferring files for sequential review, comprising: accessing a restrictive criteria to select a list of files; determining an order of file transfer based on a sort criterion; queuing the files on the list according to the order of file transfer; and transferring automatically the queued files in a sequential order into a local cache for sequential review at a client (Mogul, (Title, Abstract, Figures 1-2, column 1 lines 59-65, column 2 lines 22-44, column 4 lines 5-24, lines 37-52; Guedalia, Abstract, Figures 1-2, column 8 lines 23-33, column 9 lines 19-29).

31. Regarding claim 22, Mogul disclosed a method wherein said transferring comprises receiving a user-specified quantity [criteria] of files to be transferred; and transferring the user-specified quantity [criteria] of files into the local cache (column 4 lines 5-13).

Art Unit: 2144

32. Regarding claim 23, Mogul disclosed a method further comprising: receiving a format change during said transferring; and transferring subsequent files on the list according to the format change (column 2 lines 23-44).

33. Regarding claim 24, Mogul disclosed a method further comprising: receiving a revised sort criterion from the client; determining a revised order of file transfer based on the revised sort criterion; and queuing the files on the list according to the revised order of file transfer (Abstract, column 4 lines 5-24, lines 37-52).

34. Regarding claim 25, Mogul disclosed a method further comprising: sending the list to the client; and receiving, from the client, a first selection of a file from the list, wherein said queuing comprises queuing the first selection as the first file and queuing subsequent files according to the order of file transfer (Abstract, column 4 lines 5-24, lines 37-52).

35. Regarding claim 26, Guedalia disclosed a method further comprising: receiving a request to cancel an item from the list; and removing the item from at least one of the list or the queued files (column 10 lines 36-48).

36. Regarding claim 27, Mogul disclosed a method further comprising receiving a non-sequential request for an item on the list, wherein said queuing comprises queuing the requested item as the first file and queuing subsequent files according to the order of file transfer (column 4 lines 5-24, lines 37-52).

37. Regarding claim 28, Guedalia disclosed a method further comprising: receiving a user-specified image resolution format or a user-specified file format for the files; and processing the files to comply with the image resolution format or the file format prior to executing said transferring (column 5 lines 21-33, lines 56-67, column 6 lines 4-17).

Art Unit: 2144

38. Regarding claim 29, Guedalia disclosed a method further comprising receiving a user-defined parameter to establish a size of a queue for holding the queued files (column 10 lines 24-35, column 20 lines 8-19).

39. Regarding claim 30, Guedalia disclosed a method further comprising transferring, into the local cache, all files held in the queue at once (column 10 lines 24-35, column 20 lines 8-19).

40. Since all the limitations of the claimed invention were disclosed by the combination of Mogul and Guedalia, claims 2, 15, and 21-30 are rejected.

41. Claims 8-14 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mogul (U.S. Patent Number 5,802,292) in view of Guedalia et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,535,878), hereinafter referred to as Guedalia, and further in view of Schulhof et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,557,541), hereinafter referred as Schulhof.

42. Regarding claim 8, Mogul disclosed a method for prequeuing of files predicted to be desired by a user, comprising: defining a restrictive criteria to select a list of files (Abstract, Figure 2, column 2 lines 22-44); transferring files on the list into a local cache, in anticipation of a user selection thereof, files already transferred to the local cache having a shorter delay for review than those which have not been previously transferred to the local cache, an order of file transfer being responsive to the prediction of user review requirements, the prediction being responsive to any change in a user deviation from the predicted order (Title, Abstract, Figures 1-2, column 1 lines 59-65, column 2 lines 7-16, column 4 lines 5-24); receiving a starting point within the list of files, for file review, from the user, such that predicted latencies for sequential file review from any

Art Unit: 2144

starting point are optimized (Abstract, Figure 2, column 3 lines 54-57, column 4 lines 5-24, lines 38-52). Guedalia disclosed a step of automatically transferring files on the list to the client storage media (Abstract, Figures 1-2, column 8 lines 23-33, column 9 lines 19-29).

43. Mogul did not expressly disclose a method wherein predicted latencies are minimized. However, Schulhof disclosed an element wherein predicted latencies are minimized by queuing the records in a fast hard disk drive (column 10 lines 53-61).

44. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to employ a prequeuing system wherein the prequeuing system is responsive to any change in the sequence of user review, such that predicted latencies for sequential file review from any given starting point are minimized in order to provide user with seamless stream of digital content. Latencies in a multimedia digital content are usually unacceptable. Most users do not want to experience delay when they are trying to listen to music or to watch a video stream (Mogul, column 1 lines 32-39, lines 60-65).

45. Regarding claim 9, Schulhof disclosed a method wherein the transferring of files is executed to reduce predicted latencies or increase a throughput of the connection between a source of the files being transferred and the local cache (column 9 lines 10-18, column 10 lines 57-61).

46. Regarding claim 10, Schulhof disclosed a method wherein the transferring of files is executed to reduce predicted latencies or implement an apparent strategy for review of records by the user (column 10 lines 13-24).

Art Unit: 2144

47. Regarding claim 11, Schulhof disclosed a method wherein the transferring of files is executed to reduce predicted latencies or a cost of the record downloads (column 10 lines 13-24, lines 41-44).

48. Regarding claim 12, Schulhof disclosed a method wherein the transferring of files is executed to reduce predicted latencies predicted latencies or a cost of on-line time (column 9 lines 27-35, column 10 lines 11-24).

49. Regarding claim 13, Schulhof disclosed a method wherein the transferring of files is executed to reduce predicted latencies predicted latencies or increase a value of the user's time (column 2 lines 13-28, column 8 lines 4-13, and column 9 lines 57-60).

50. Regarding claim 14, Schulhof disclosed a method wherein the transferring of files is executed to reduce predicted latencies or a burden a burden on the server (column 9 lines 54-60, column 11 lines 20-25).

51. Regarding claim 16, Schulhof disclosed a browser further comprising an accounting system for accounting for downloading of each object (column 6 lines 33-48).

52. Regarding claims 17-19, the limitations of claims 17-20 correspond to the limitations of claims 8-10, and 11, and thus these claims are rejected using the same rationale.

53. Regarding claim 20, Mogul and Schulhof combined disclose a browser wherein the transferring of objects is optimized based on both predicted latencies ((column 10 lines 53-61) and a value of user's time (column 1 lines 32-44, column 4 lines 13-24).

54. Since all the limitations of the claimed invention were disclosed by the combination of Mogul and Schulhof, claims 8-14 and 16-20 are rejected.

Response to Arguments

55. Applicant's arguments filed 11/09/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

56. In response to applicant's argument that "Van Ryzin does not teach or suggest, for example, "interrupting the downloading by selecting a non-sequential record from the list", the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Van Ryzin disclosed "Once the playlist is created, it may then be easily modified if so desired at any future time by performing such functions as adding tracks, deleting tracks, and rearranging tracks of the playlist through the external device. Again, these functions may be performed by the user through the interface of the external device or by software resident on the digital audio/visual actuator device" (column 3 lines 6-12), and "The entire playlist or individual tracks of the playlist may be downloaded from the external device to the digital audio/visual actuator device" (column 3 line 66-column 4 line 1), it should be obvious then that when the user navigates to a non-sequential track in the list, the downloading point will render from the selected track.

57. In response to applicant's argument, "Referring to Col. 5, lines 59-67, Van Ryzin teaches that any modifications to its playlist must be performed on the personal computer before the playlist is downloaded, or by the CD player after the playlist has been downloaded", the fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985). Van Ryzin disclosed "music CDs are now available over the Internet and tracks from such CDs may be added to the custom

Art Unit: 2144

playlist to be played by audio/visual actuator device 10. It should be further noted that, as shown in FIG. 4, external device 14 may download the custom playlist to remote control unit 22 via communications link 20 in addition to downloading the playlist to audio/visual actuator device 10. In this way, it is possible for remote control unit 22 to control audio/visual actuator device 10 by sending to it appropriate control commands concerning playing the playlist (Figure 3, column 4 line 61-column 5 line 4)",

"Alternatively, the external device, such as a PC, could be used to command the CD player to play a certain track, one at a time" (column 6 lines 56-57), and "the custom playlist may be modified in a variety of ways. Modification of the playlist is performed by external device 14 and may include deleting tracks from the playlist, rearranging tracks in the playlist, and adding tracks to the playlist" (column 6 lines 58-62. Thus, it is submitted that Van Ryzin does enable the user to modify the playlist during the downloading process.

58. Applicant's argued, "Specifically, Guedalia teaches that media or portions of media are automatically downloaded" but only after said media is requested by a user. Therefore, Guedalia's "automatic download" does not infer without (e.g., "in anticipation of ", or "in advance of") a user request as in Applicants' invention", it is submitted that Mogul taught the limitation of "transferring files on the list into a local cache, in anticipation of a user selection thereof..." and Guedalia was relied upon to disclose the automatic transferring files feature. Thus, in response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091,

Art Unit: 2144

231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In addition, pre-fetch or look ahead or anticipatory caching techniques are well known in the art at the time the invention was made. Please refer to PTO-892 for cited references.

59. In response to applicant's comments regarding provisional application, the Examiner has made appropriate changes in accordance with provisional application 60/160,242. Examiner is appreciative of the courtesy shown by Applicant in discussing this matter.

60. As the rejection reads, Examiner asserts that the combination of these teachings render the claimed invention obvious.

Conclusion

61. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

62. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Refer to the enclosed PTO-892 for details.

Art Unit: 2144

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tam (Jenny) Phan whose telephone number is (571) 272-3930. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Cuchlinski can be reached on (571) 272-3925. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



William Cuchlinski
SPE
Art Unit 2144
(571) 272-3925

tp
March 21, 2005